



External Assessment Report 2012

Subject(s)	Care
Level(s)	Intermediate 2

The statistics used in this report are pre-appeal.

This report provides information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers/lecturers in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding. It would be helpful to read this report in conjunction with the published question papers and marking instructions for the examination.

Comments on candidate performance

General comments

Candidate numbers were up slightly this year from 664 in 2011 to 711 in 2012. Overall, the standard of candidate response was good and was comparable with 2011.

Many candidates grasped concepts well giving comprehensive answers with good use of vocabulary that was relevant to the questions asked.

Most candidates were entered at the correct level and were well prepared. A few were entered at too high a level and may have been better placed at Intermediate 1 for subsequent progression to Intermediate 2.

At times, the standard of English and spelling was poor and these candidates may have benefited from a scribe.

Areas in which candidates performed well

Section A

Overall some very good responses in this section.

Section B

Question 3: Good responses from the majority of candidates.

Section C

Question 1: Once again good responses from many candidates.

Areas which candidates found demanding

Section A

Question 1: Many candidates had difficulty in describing how nurture could affect nature.

Question 2: Some very basic answers to this question, which resulted in candidates not accessing all the marks available.

Question 3 (b): Most candidates lacked an understanding of what the term 'Ego-states' means. They could give examples but could not describe the term.

Question 5: Some candidates did not seem to understand the question.

Question 6: Many candidates did not refer to 'humanist approach' in the responses and therefore lost significant marks.

Section B

Question 2: Some candidates confused the socialisation process with socialising.

Question 5: Generally poorly answered, candidates did not explain the benefits of using a sociological explanation.

Question 7: Some candidates did not give examples from a care context.

Section C

Question 5: Once again some candidates did not identify needs from the case study but instead identified issues/difficulties.

Advice to centres for preparation of future candidates

General

Centres should continue to ensure candidates are entered at the appropriate level. Candidates would also benefit from the use of formative assessment as well as prelim papers that reflect the current format of the external exam. It would also be advantageous to encourage significant practice in application of knowledge to case studies.

Centres should stress to candidates the difference between Knowledge and Understanding (KU) and Analysis and Evaluation (AE)/Application (App) type questions.

It would also be beneficial for candidates to have a clear understanding of matching the amount of detail to the mark allocation given to questions and not to spend time rewriting the question.

As mentioned in previous reports, candidates would benefit from a sound understanding of key words.

Clear and honest feedback from NABs and formative assessment will guide the candidates to focus on specific areas for development in preparation for the external exam.

Statistical information: update on Courses

Intermediate 2

Number of resulted entries in 2011	664
------------------------------------	-----

Number of resulted entries in 2012	711
------------------------------------	-----

Statistical information: performance of candidates

Distribution of Course awards including grade boundaries

Distribution of Course awards	%	Cum. %	Number of candidates	Lowest mark
Maximum Mark 80				
A	26.2%	26.2%	186	56
B	24.3%	50.5%	173	48
C	26.3%	76.8%	187	40
D	3.7%	80.5%	26	36
No award	19.5%	100.0%	139	-

General commentary on grade boundaries

While SQA aims to set examinations and create marking instructions which will allow a competent candidate to score a minimum of 50% of the available marks (the notional C boundary) and a well prepared, very competent candidate to score at least 70% of the available marks (the notional A boundary), it is very challenging to get the standard on target every year, in every subject at every level.

Each year SQA therefore holds a grade boundary meeting for each subject at each level where it brings together all the information available (statistical and judgemental). The Principal Assessor and SQA Qualifications Manager meet with the relevant SQA Business Manager and Statistician to discuss the evidence and make decisions. The meetings are chaired by members of the management team at SQA.

The grade boundaries can be adjusted downwards if there is evidence that the exam is more challenging than usual, allowing the pass rate to be unaffected by this circumstance.

The grade boundaries can be adjusted upwards if there is evidence that the exam is less challenging than usual, allowing the pass rate to be unaffected by this circumstance.

Where standards are comparable to previous years, similar grade boundaries are maintained.

An exam paper at a particular level in a subject in one year tends to have a marginally different set of grade boundaries from exam papers in that subject at that level in other years. This is because the particular questions, and the mix of questions, are different. This is also the case for exams set in centres. If SQA has already altered a boundary in a particular year in, say, Higher Chemistry this does not mean that centres should necessarily alter boundaries in their prelim exam in Higher Chemistry. The two are not that closely related as they do not contain identical questions.

SQA's main aim is to be fair to candidates across all subjects and all levels and maintain comparable standards across the years, even as Arrangements evolve and change.